

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,769	10/30/2003	Elena Grassi	Q78055	6931
23373 75	590 01/20/2006		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE M		LAVARIAS, ARNEL C		
2100 PENNSY SUITE 800	LVANIA AVENUE, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037		2872	
			DATE MAILED: 01/20/2000	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Ů
10/695,769	GRASSI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Amel C. Lavarias	2872	

	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	s
TH	HE REPLY FILED 11 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandon this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	which 41.31; or (3)
	time periods:	ure lollowing
	a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
1	b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whiche no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILE TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
hav uno set ma	ktensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate exact been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate ander 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office a forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even ay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). OTICE OF APPEAL	extension fee action; or (2) a
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months o	f the date of
	filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the apparaments a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).	
	MENDMENTS	
3.	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered becar (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	use
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the appeal; and/or	issues for
	(d) X They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
	NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTG	OL-324).
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	OL 024).
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment of	canceling the
	non-allowable claim(s).	
<i>(</i> .	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explain how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	anation of
	Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	
	Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.	
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AF	FFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
₿. ∣	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is ne was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9.	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
10.	D. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.	
RE	EQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11.	I. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance See Continuation Sheet.	because:
	2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
13.	3. Other:	•
	Smil (. Favar	Ules
	Amel C. Lavarias	
	Amel C. Lavarias Patent Examiner Group Art Unit 2	1877
_	THE PART AND THE	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed addition of Claims 13-14 require further consideration and search of the available prior art. In addition, the proposed amendments do not cancel a corresponding number of claims.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' remarks and arguments are noted, however they were not found persuasive. Examiner again reiterates that, as previously stated in Section 6 of the Office Action dated 10/11/05, though the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. In particular, the limitation that '...the axes for the transmitting beam and the receiving beam are in the centers of the respective beams' (See Page 9 of Applicants' submission dated 1/11/06) is not recited in any of the pending claims.